

Appendix A

# **CEQA Environmental Checklist**

## Appendix A

# Environmental Checklist

1. **Project Title:** Delta-Mendota Canal / California Aqueduct Intertie
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**  
NEPA: U.S. Department of Interior  
Bureau of Reclamation  
2800 Cottage Way, MP-700  
Sacramento, CA 95825  
  
CEQA: San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority  
1521 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:**  
NEPA: Patricia Roberson  
Bureau of Reclamation  
(916) 978-5074  
  
CEQA: Tom Boardman  
San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority  
(916) 441-2249
4. **Project Location:** The Proposed Action is located in an unincorporated area of eastern Alameda County, at milepost 7.2 of the Delta-Mendota Canal (DMC) connecting to milepost 9.0 of the California Aqueduct.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Reclamation  
2800 Cottage Way, MP-700  
Sacramento, CA 95825
6. **General Plan Designation:** General Agriculture
7. **Zoning:** General Agriculture

- 8. Description of Project:** The Proposed Action is to construct and operate an underground pipeline connection—or *Intertie*—between the DMC and the California Aqueduct. Components of the Intertie include a 450-cfs pumping plant, a plant switchyard, and buried steel pipes. The Intertie includes realigning an existing O&M road and installing aboveground transmission lines, which would be powered by the Tracy switchyard, approximately 4.5 miles to the north.
- 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The Proposed Action is located in an unincorporated area of eastern Alameda County, at milepost 7.2 of the DMC connecting to milepost 9.0 of the California Aqueduct. Limited development, rural in nature, is present in the area. Land uses surrounding the project corridor include Interstates 205 and 580, ½ mile to the south, the Altamont Speedway to the southeast, agriculture land, open space, and numerous transmission lines and pipelines. The landscape consists of steep, rolling grassland hillsides along with flat grassland plains. Trees are few and scattered.
- 10. Other Public Agencies whose Approval Is Required:**
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR)—Approvals are required from DWR to construct a portion of the Intertie on State property and to use state facilities to convey Central Valley Project (CVP) water.
  - Regional Water Quality Control Board—Because the project site is more than 1 acre, a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) will be developed as required by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
  - Bay Area Air Quality Management District—Compliance with rules concerning fugitive dust and control of fine particulate matter from construction activities.
  - Alameda County—An erosion and sediment control plan will be developed to include all necessary local jurisdiction requirements regarding erosion and sediment control as required.
  - US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)—Section 7 of the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) requires all federal agencies to ensure that any action they authorize, fund, or carry out is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat. Therefore, Reclamation will consult with USFWS regarding the proposed action.
  - California Department of Fish and Game (DFG)—DFG administers the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) for all native species of fish, plants, and wildlife. Like the ESA, CESA prohibits the take of any listed species.
  - Advisory Council on Historic Preservation/State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)—Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires federal agencies to evaluate the effects of federal undertakings on historical, archaeological, and cultural resources. Therefore, Reclamation is required to coordinate with the SHPO and other interested parties throughout the Section 106 process.

### Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below would potentially be affected by this project (i.e., the project would involve at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact”), as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources            | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality            | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources               | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems       | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |   |

### Determination:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have an impact on the environment that is “potentially significant” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

For

## Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained if it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an environmental impact report (EIR) is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies when the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from a “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less-than-Significant Impact”. The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced.)
5. Earlier analyses may be used if, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration [Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where earlier analyses are available for review.
  - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, when appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I.</b>	<b>AESTHETICS.</b> Would the project:				
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c.	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Criteria for Determining Significance

The analysis to determine the significance of impacts of the Proposed Action is based on criteria *I. a–d* described in the environmental checklist above. In general, projects that result in substantial changes to land forms, remove or add significant structures, or substantially disrupt the visual context with their surroundings would be considered to have a significant visual impact.

## Discussion of Environmental Consequences

### Proposed Action

- a. The Proposed Action would entail the construction and operation of an underground pipeline connection between the DMC and the California Aqueduct, and pumping plant and switchyard located along the DMC. Additionally, the Proposed Action would call for the installation of overhead power lines that would run approximately 4.5 miles along the service road to the Tracy switchyard. The project area is accessible only by private service roads and is largely unseen from public roadways.

Based on a review of Alameda County's East County Area Plan, the project area is not located on or near a scenic vista, a state scenic highway, or other officially designated scenic roadway. Because the Proposed Action is not located in the vicinity of an officially designated scenic resource (such as a scenic vista or viewing area) no impacts on designated resources would occur as a result of implementing the Proposed Action.

- b. Please see the response for "a" above.

- c. The proposed Intertie connection between the DMC and the California Aqueduct would be constructed underground. The pumping plant, plant switchyard, and power lines would be added features to the landscape. However, the surrounding area presently includes similar structures such as canal bridges, transmission lines, and switchyards and is bordered to the south by two interstates. Furthermore, project construction would be short-term in nature, occur in previously disturbed rights of way (ROWs), and largely be hidden from any public viewpoint. Because the project components would be consistent with the existing character of the landscape, and the number of viewers is relatively small, any aesthetic impacts from the Proposed Action are considered less than significant.
- d. The Proposed Action's pumping plant and plant switchyard would introduce a new low-level source of light. However, because this lighting would be similar to a standard porch light and would not produce substantial light or glare, it would not have a substantial impact.

### **No Action**

- a–d. Under the No Action Alternative, the CVP would continue operations as they are today; no Intertie would be constructed or operated. Therefore, the visual characteristics of the project area would not be altered under the No Action Alternative.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

The Proposed Action would introduce two new visible components to the project area: a pumping plant and switchyard in addition to 4.5 miles of power lines along the service road. These structures are consistent with the existing character of the landscape. The Proposed Action would not make a cumulative considerable contribution to the aesthetics of the surrounding area.



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> In determining whether impacts on agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation. Would the project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Criteria for Determining Significance

The analysis to determine the significance of impacts of the Proposed Action is based on criteria **II. a–c** described in the environmental checklist above.

## Discussion of Environmental Consequences

### Proposed Action

- The Proposed Action would be constructed in federal and state lands and ROWs that have been previously disturbed and do not support agriculture. The project area does not include prime or unique farmlands and, therefore, would not have an effect on such lands.
- Although the Proposed Action is located adjacent to areas designated for agriculture, the project would be constructed and operated on federal and state lands and ROWs. Furthermore, because public water supply and treatment facilities are exempt from zoning requirements as set forth in California Government Code Section 53091, the Proposed Action is not subject to the

requirements of the Chapter 9 County Development Title, which serves as the County Zoning Code. As a result, no impact would occur.

- c. The Proposed Action would not exert any pressure for conversion of agricultural land to another use; there would be no impact.

### **No Action Alternative**

- a–c. Under the No Action Alternative, the CVP would continue operations as they are today; no Intertie would be constructed or operated. As described in Chapter 2, it is anticipated that factors affecting the DMC capacity would continue to occur and repairs and maintenance would increase as time goes by. These actions could further constrain the Tracy Pumping Plant from pumping to its authorized pumping capacity and therefore limit the amount of water available to CVP contractors. A decrease in pumping at Tracy Pumping Plant and consequent decrease in CVP allocations could have an impact on agriculture production. If farmers are unable to secure an alternative source of water, there is a possibility that their land may be removed from production. However, it is difficult at this broad level of analysis to make any conclusions about how changing water supply reliability would affect land use patterns.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

The Proposed Action would not result in the temporary or permanent disruption of agricultural activities and would not contribute to the loss of agricultural land.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>III. AIR QUALITY.</b> When available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Note: See Section 3.7, "Air Quality," for a more detailed analysis of the Proposed Action's impact to air quality.

## Criteria for Determining Significance

The analysis to determine the significance of impacts of the Proposed Action is based on criteria **III. a–e** described in the environmental checklist above. Section 3.7, "Air Quality," includes additional criteria that were used to determine the level of significance.

## Discussion of Environmental Consequences

### Proposed Action

- a. The Proposed Action would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans. Emissions associated with the Proposed Action would be subject to Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) rules and regulations. Consequently, the project would not conflict with, obstruct, or have any impact on implementation of existing or proposed BAAQMD

air quality plans. Because environmental commitments have been incorporated into the project description, this impact is considered less than significant as discussed in Section 3.7, "Air Quality." The environmental commitments will ensure compliance with BAAQMD rules and regulations.

- b–d. Effects on air quality can be divided into short-term, construction-related effects and those associated with long-term operation of the project. Construction activities may generate temporary increases in reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), and particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>). The BAAQMD has determined that compliance with its Feasible Control Measures for Construction Emissions of PM<sub>10</sub> (BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines 1999) is sufficient to minimize adverse air quality effects from construction. Therefore, construction-related impacts are considered less than significant. There are no long-term operational emissions associated with the Proposed Action.
- e. The Proposed Action would generate odors temporarily from diesel exhaust during construction activities. These odors are considered less than significant because construction odors would be temporary and would not affect a substantial number of people.

### **No Action**

The No Action Alternative would consist of a continuation of existing CVP operations; as a result, no impacts on air quality would occur.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

The Proposed Action contributes only to short-term air quality construction impacts and not to long-term air quality operational impacts. Therefore, there are no air quality cumulative impacts associated with the Proposed Action.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b>	Would the project:				
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f.	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Note: See Section 3.5, "Fish," and Section 3.6, "Wildlife and Vegetation," for additional information on biological resources.

## Criteria for Determining Significance

The analysis to determine the significance of impacts of the Proposed Action is based on criteria *IV. a–f* described in the environmental checklist above. Criteria additional to the criteria detailed above were applied for fish and wildlife and vegetation; please see Section 3.5, “Fish,” and Section 3.6, “Wildlife and Vegetation,” respectively, for further information.

## Discussion of Environmental Consequences

### Proposed Action

- a. Please refer to Section 3.5, “Fish,” and Section 3.6, “Wildlife and Vegetation,” for discussion.
- b. Please refer to Section 3.5, “Fish,” and Section 3.6, “Wildlife and Vegetation,” for discussion.
- c. The drainages located to the northwest and south of the project site and the creeks along the transmission ROW route would be completely avoided during construction of the Proposed Action. Project construction does not include any other waters of the United States. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not have a substantial impact on federally protected waters of the United States.
- d. Please refer to Section 3.5, “Fish,” and Section 3.6, “Wildlife and Vegetation,” for discussion.
- e. The Proposed Action would not require the removal of any trees. A small number of shrubs would be removed, but they are not considered special-status or species of concern. The Proposed Action would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.
- f. The Proposed Action is located in a rural, agricultural area and would not conflict with any local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No impact would occur.

### No Action

The No Action Alternative would consist of a continuation of existing CVP operations; as a result, no impacts on biological resources would occur.

### Cumulative Impacts

Please refer to Section 3.5, “Fish,” and Section 3.6, “Wildlife and Vegetation” for discussion of cumulative impacts.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b>	Would the project:				
a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Note: See Section 3.11, "Cultural Resources," for additional information on cultural resources.

## Criteria for Determining Significance

The analysis to determine the significance of impacts of the Proposed Action is based on criteria *V. a–d* described in the environmental checklist above. Criteria in addition to those detailed above were applied for cultural resources; please see Section 3.11, "Cultural Resources," for further information.

## Discussion of Environmental Consequences

### Proposed Action

a–d. Please refer to Section 3.11, "Cultural Resources," for discussion of environmental consequences.

### No Action

The No Action Alternative would consist of a continuation of existing CVP operations; as a result, no impacts on cultural resources would occur.

### Cumulative Impacts

With implementation of the identified measures, the Proposed Action would avoid impacts on cultural resources, would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource, and would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature or cause unauthorized disturbance of any human remains. No

impacts on cultural resources (including historical resources, paleontological resources, and human remains) would result from implementation of the Proposed Action that would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to an impact on cultural resources.



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Strong seismic groundshaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Criteria for Determining Significance

The analysis of determining the significance of impacts of the Proposed Action on geology and soils is based on professional judgment and on criteria **VI. a-e** described in the environmental checklist above.

## Discussion of Environmental Consequences

### Proposed Action

- a.1. According to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, no known earthquake faults are located in the immediate vicinity of the proposed action. Therefore, there would be no impact.
- a.2. Although no known faults are located in the project area, the project area could experience strong ground shaking during an earthquake on active fault zones located in the region. To address this potential hazard, Reclamation would design and construct all proposed project facilities in accordance with applicable standards from the CBSC (24 CCR), which would substantially reduce the potential for structural damage to occur during an earthquake. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.
- a.3. According to the geotechnical report prepared for Reclamation, the project area is underlain by material that may be susceptible to liquefaction during an earthquake. To address this potential hazard, Reclamation will conduct detailed subsurface investigations during the final stages of project design to more accurately characterize liquefaction susceptibility in the project area. Additionally, Reclamation will ensure that all proposed project facilities are designed and constructed in accordance with applicable standards from the CBSC, which would substantially reduce the potential for structural damage to occur during an earthquake. Therefore, this impact is considered to be less than significant.
- a.4. According to the geotechnical report prepared for Reclamation, landslides have occurred on the western side of the California Aqueduct during its construction. Accordingly, the proposed action area may be subject to landsliding or trench wall failure during pipeline installation. To address this potential hazard, Reclamation will conduct detailed geotechnical investigations during the final stages of project design to more accurately characterize the potential for landsliding and trench failure to occur during construction. Based on the findings of these investigations, Reclamation will implement construction methods and engineering techniques necessary to ensure that landslides do not affect the pipeline and that trench walls are stable or otherwise shored during project construction. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.
- b. The grading, trenching, and other earthwork that would be conducted during construction of the proposed project would result in substantial ground disturbance that would increase the hazard of erosion and could temporarily increase erosion and sedimentation rates above preconstruction levels. Accelerated erosion and sedimentation resulting from construction-related ground disturbance could result in the loss of appreciable quantities of soil and adversely affect water quality in nearby surface waters.

To address this potential hazard and to comply with applicable erosion control and water quality regulations, a qualified engineer or erosion control specialist will prepare an erosion and sediment control plan and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Both plans will specify best management practices (BMPs) that will be implemented to control runoff, accelerated erosion, and sedimentation during construction. The BMPs will be maintained until all project structures and facilities have been installed and areas disturbed during construction have been revegetated. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

- c. Please see the responses for a.3, a.4, and b. above.

- d. According to the geotechnical report, the project area contains expansive soils. Soil expansion and contraction could damage the proposed pipeline, causing leaks and erosion downgradient. To address this potential hazard, Reclamation will ensure that all proposed project facilities are designed and constructed in accordance with applicable standards from the CBSC, which would substantially reduce the potential for structural damage to occur from expansive soils. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.
- e. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would be installed as part of the proposed action.

### **No Action**

The No Action Alternative would consist of a continuation of existing CVP operations; as a result, no impacts on geologic resources would occur.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

The Proposed Action consists of the construction and operation of a pumping plant, plant switchyard, transmission lines, and an Intertie between the DMC and California Aqueduct. As described above, with the implementation of environmental commitments as described in Chapter 2, the Proposed Action would not expose persons to substantial risk of loss, injury, or death relative to geologic hazards; result in substantial soil erosion; potentially result in landslides; create substantial risks attributable to expansive soils; or produce wastewater from septic tanks, sewers, or other disposal facilities. The contribution of the Proposed Action to cumulative impacts is less than considerable.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b>					
	Would the project:				
a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d.	Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f.	Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Criteria for Determining Significance

The analysis of determining the significance of impacts of the Proposed Action is based on criteria *VII. a–h* described in the environmental checklist above and on the following factors:

- potential hazards and/or hazardous materials encountered during trenching or any subsurface excavation, and
- proper disposal of hazardous materials encountered during trenching or any subsurface excavation.

## Discussion of Environmental Consequences

- a. The Proposed Action involves the construction of a pumping plant, plant switchyard, transmission lines, and a pipeline connection (Intertie) between the DMC and California Aqueduct. Although small quantities of commonly used materials such as fuels and oils would be used temporarily during construction to operate construction equipment, this impact is considered less than significant because a SWPPP will be prepared as discussed in Chapter 2. Furthermore, standard construction procedures will be implemented to reduce the emissions of dust or other pollutants during construction of the Proposed Action. Any potentially contaminated areas, if encountered during project construction, will be evaluated by a qualified hazardous materials specialist in the context of applicable local, state, and federal regulations governing hazardous waste. Handling and storage of fuels, flammable materials, and common construction-related hazardous materials are governed by California Occupational Safety and Health (OSHA) standards for storage and fire prevention.
- b. Please see the response for “a” above.
- c. No hazardous emissions would be generated by the Proposed Action; nor would any hazardous emissions or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste be handled within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school. Furthermore, the construction contractor will not locate a staging area near an existing or proposed school. All applicable federal, state, and local laws governing the storage, transportation, use, handling, and disposal of hazardous materials will be followed by project personnel during construction and operation of the Proposed Action.
- d. Please see the response for “a” above.
- e. The project site is not in the vicinity of any public use airport and, therefore, would not have any impact that would impair airport operations or result in a safety hazard.
- f. Review of the California Aviation System Plan (California Department of Transportation 2001) does not indicate the presence of any private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. The Proposed Action would have no impact.
- g. Construction of the Proposed Action would take place within federal and state lands and ROWs. Access to the project site is restricted to authorized personnel only and accessible via private roadways that are gated and locked. Construction of the Proposed Action would not impair or interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- h. The Proposed Action would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death attributable to wildland fires; therefore, the Proposed Action would have no impact.

## **No Action**

This alternative would consist of a continuation of existing conditions. Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no changes to existing operations that would cause impacts related to hazardous materials and wastes.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

The site of the Proposed Action does not contain any hazardous materials or wastes. Although small quantities of commonly used materials such as fuels and oils would be used temporarily during construction, standard construction procedures will be used, including the development of a SWPPP to prevent any accidental spills. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not make a considerable contribution toward cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials and wastes.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b>					
	Would the project:				
a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e.	Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g.	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
j.	Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Note: for additional information on water quality please see Section 3.4, "Water Quality."

## Criteria for Determining Significance

The analysis of determining the significance of impacts of the Proposed Action is based on criteria **VIII. a–j** described in the environmental checklist above. Also see Section 3.4, "Water Quality," for additional information.

## Discussion of Environmental Consequences

### Proposed Action

- a. Please refer to Section 3.4, "Water Quality," for discussion of environmental consequences.
- b. The Proposed Action entails the construction and operation of a pumping plant, plant switchyard, transmission lines, and Intertie between the DMC and California Aqueduct. It would have no impact on groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.
- c. Construction of the Proposed Action has been designed to avoid sensitive water bodies that support critical habitat or listed or proposed species. The Proposed Action would not alter existing drainage patterns through the alteration of a stream or river. Therefore, no impact would occur.
- d. As stated above, the construction of the Proposed Action has been designed to avoid sensitive water bodies that support critical habitat or listed or proposed species. The Proposed Action would not alter existing drainage patterns through the alteration of a stream or river, nor would the Proposed Action substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff. Consequently, there would be no impact.
- e. As discussed in Chapter 2, the Proposed Action would require the construction of a new access road to connect the DMC and California Aqueduct. The access road would be approximately 400 feet long and would be paved for all-weather access. Guardrails, drainage culverts, and erosion control measures would be installed to control surface runoff. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.
- f. Please see Section 3.4, "Water Quality," for discussion of environmental consequences.
- g. The Proposed Action does not require construction of housing units or other structures within the 100-year floodplain; therefore, no impact would occur.



- h. As stated above, the Proposed Action would not place any structures within a 100-year flood hazard area; no impact would occur.
- i. The Proposed Action would not have an effect on levees or dams and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding.
- j. The Proposed Action would not affect the potential for inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

### **No Action**

Please refer to Section 3.4, "Water Quality," for discussion of the No Action Alternative.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

Please refer to Section 3.4, "Water Quality," for discussion of cumulative impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

For additional information on land use please see Section 3.10, "Land Use."

## Criteria for Determining Significance

The analysis of determining the significance of impacts of the Proposed Action on land use is based on criteria **IX. a–c** described in the environmental checklist above.

## Discussion of Environmental Consequences

### Proposed Action

- The Proposed Action is located on federal and state lands and ROWs and consists of an underground pipeline (Intertie), pumping plant, plant switchyard, and transmission lines. Construction and operation of the Proposed Action would not result in the physical division of an established community; therefore no impact would occur.
- Although the Proposed Action is located adjacent to areas designated for agriculture, the project would be constructed and operated on federal and state lands and ROWs. Furthermore, because public water supply and treatment facilities are exempt from zoning requirements as set forth in California Government Code Section 53091, the Proposed Action is not subject to the requirements of the Chapter 9 County Development Title, which serves as the County Zoning Code. As a result, no impact would occur.
- No habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans are applicable to the construction or operation of the Proposed Action; therefore, the project would not conflict with any existing plans.

## **No Action**

This alternative would consist of a continuation of existing conditions. Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no changes to existing operations that would cause impacts related to land use.

## **Cumulative Impacts**

The Proposed Action would not result in the physical division of a community or conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Although the Proposed Action is adjacent to areas designated for general agriculture, the project would be constructed and operated on federal and state lands and ROWs. Therefore, no cumulative impacts on land use would occur.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>X.</b>	<b>MINERAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b.	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Criteria for Determining Significance

The analysis of determining the significance of impacts of the Proposed Action to mineral resources is based on criteria *X. a–b* described in the environmental checklist above.

## Discussion of Environmental Consequences

### Proposed Action

- a. The project location and surrounding vicinity do not contain any known mineral resources (Bruce Jensen pers. comm.). The Proposed Action would have no impact on known mineral resources because none are present in the Proposed Action area.
- b. The project location and surrounding vicinity do not contain any known mineral resources (Bruce Jensen pers. comm.). The Proposed Action would have no impact on locally important mineral resources because none are present in the Proposed Action area.

### No Action

This alternative would consist of a continuation of existing conditions. Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no changes to existing operations that would cause impacts related to mineral resources.

### Cumulative Impacts

Because there are no known mineral resources in the project area, the Proposed Action would have no impact on mineral resources and would therefore not contribute to a cumulative impact.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XI. NOISE.</b>	Would the project:				
a.	Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f.	Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Note: For additional information on noise please see Section 3.8, "Noise."

## Criteria for Determining Significance

The analysis of determining the significance of noise impacts of the Proposed Action is based on the criteria **XI. a–f** described in the environmental checklist above and Alameda County General Plan Noise Guidelines (see Section 3.8, "Noise").

## Environmental Consequences

### Proposed Action

- a. Please see Section 3.8, "Noise," for additional information.

- b. Construction-related activities would generate minimum groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. This impact is considered less than significant. Please see Section 3.8, "Noise," for additional information.
- c. The Proposed Action would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. This impact is considered less than significant. Please see Section 3.8, "Noise," for additional information.
- d. Please see Section 3.8, "Noise," for additional information.
- e-f. The Proposed Action is not located within an airport land use plan area or within the vicinity of a private airstrip; no impact would occur.

### **No Action**

Under the No Action Alternative, expected and potential noise sources would continue as at present. There would be no impact on noise.

### **Cumulative Impact**

The Proposed Action would not have any growth-inducing impacts. Consequently, the Proposed Action would not have any cumulative noise impacts attributable to noise from increased population growth. In addition, construction-related noise impacts would be short-term and would cease once construction is complete. Therefore, construction-related noise impacts would not result in any cumulative noise impacts.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b>	Would the project:				
a.	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c.	Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Criteria for Determining Significance

The analysis of determining the significance of impacts of the Proposed Action is based on criteria **XII. a–c** described in the environmental checklist above.

## Discussion of Environmental Consequences

### Proposed Action

- a. Although the Proposed Action may result in the export of 34 thousand acre-feet (taf) of water per year to areas south of the Delta, the majority of the water (30 taf) would be allocated to agricultural use. The remainder would be allocated to Santa Clara Valley Water District (2 taf/year) and CVP contractors (2 taf/year), which would be used to serve existing populations and would not result in substantial growth. This impact is considered less than significant.
- b–c. Neither construction nor operation of the Proposed Action would displace any existing housing units, displace any number of people, or necessitate the construction of replacement housing.

### No Action

This alternative would consist of a continuation of existing conditions. Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no changes to existing operations that would cause impacts related to population and housing.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

The Proposed Action would neither produce nor displace housing. It would have no impact on population or housing and would not contribute to cumulative effects.



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> Would the project:				
a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Criteria for Determining Significance

The analysis of determining the significance of impacts of the Proposed Action is based on criteria **XIII. a** described in the environmental checklist above.

## Discussion of Environmental Consequences

### Proposed Action

- a. The Proposed Action entails the construction and operation of an Intertie between the DMC and the California Aqueduct. The Proposed Action would create no new demand for governmental services or facilities and would not require construction, alteration, or expansion of any such facilities to provide acceptable service levels.

### No Action

- a. The No Action Alternative would consist of a continuation of existing conditions. No impacts on public services would occur.

### **Cumulative Impacts**

The Proposed Action would need no public services; therefore, it would not contribute to a cumulative effect.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIV. RECREATION.</b> Would the project:				
a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Criteria for Determining Significance

The analysis of determining the significance of impacts of the Proposed Action is based on criteria *XIV. a–b* as described in the environmental checklist above.

## Discussion of Environmental Consequences

a–b. The Proposed Action is the construction and operation of an Intertie between the DMC and the California Aqueduct. It would not result in an increase in use of parks or recreational facilities, nor require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Accordingly, there would be no impacts.

### No Action

This alternative would consist of a continuation of existing conditions. No impact would occur as a result.

### Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Action would not require any recreational services. It would therefore not contribute to cumulative effects.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> Would the project:				
a. Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause, either individually or cumulatively, exceedance of a level-of-service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Criteria for Determining Significance

The analysis of determining the significance of impacts of the Proposed Action is based on criteria **XV. a–g** described in the environmental checklist above.

## Discussion of Environmental Consequences

### Proposed Action

- a. The Proposed Action is located in a rural area; access to the project site will be via existing access roads, existing ROWs, and the new O&M road, all of which have restricted access. However, travel on public roadways will be necessary to reach the project site and its restricted access. It is anticipated that there may be a slight increase in traffic on the public roadways during construction activities, in which approximately 30 truck trips per day would be needed to bring construction supplies to the project area. However, the additional truck trips would be temporary and are not expected to cause any delays on public roadways. Consequently, this impact is considered less than significant.
- b. Alameda County has established a level of service (LOS) standard of C for rural roads. The County defines LOS C as conditions of stable flow, speeds, and maneuverability more closely restricted, and occasional backups behind vehicles turning left at intersections. The Proposed Action would not exceed the LOS standard and would cause only a minimal increase in vehicles on the roadway. This impact is considered less than significant.
- c. The Proposed Action is the construction and operation of an Intertie between the DMC and the California Aqueduct and would not influence air traffic patterns nor cause a change in traffic levels or location. Therefore, the Proposed Action would have no impact with regard to air traffic.
- d. Implementation of the Proposed Action would not substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curve or dangerous intersection) because the Proposed Action would not involve modification of roadways, nor would it cause any incompatible uses on public roadways.
- e. The site of the Proposed Action is accessible by multiple routes via the private service roads; therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in inadequate emergency access. Furthermore, the facilities at the project site would require only minimal maintenance, thereby limiting the number of vehicles required to one vehicle twice daily.
- f. The Proposed Action would not increase demand for parking that would affect any public parking facilities. All construction equipment would be temporarily stored at a staging area on the construction site. No additional parking facilities are needed; therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in inadequate parking capacity.
- g. The Proposed Action is situated in a rural area accessible only by private roadways. The Proposed Action, therefore, would not have any effect on policies, plans, or programs that support alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks, etc.).

### No Action

The No Action Alternative would consist of a continuation of the existing conditions. No impact on traffic or transportation would occur as a result.

### Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Action would not result in any increase in vehicular traffic beyond the marginal temporary increase caused by construction crews. Long-term operation of the Proposed Action is

expected to call for minimal maintenance, limiting the number of vehicles required to one vehicle twice daily. Additionally, this vehicle trip would be on restricted-access roadways and would not affect public transportation. As a result, the Proposed Action would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to traffic impacts.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</b>	Would the project:				
a.	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c.	Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g.	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Criteria for Determining Significance

The analysis of determining the significance of impacts of the Proposed Action is based on criteria **XVI. a–g** described in the environmental checklist above.

## Discussion of Environmental Consequences

### Proposed Action

- a. As detailed in Chapter 2, the Proposed Action will incorporate the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) in the SWPPPs (including an erosion control plan). The plans will specify measures to minimize erosion and production of drainage water and will be prepared to meet the requirements of approval by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The impact is considered less than significant.
- b. The Proposed Action would not require or result in the construction of new treatment facilities for water or wastewater; therefore, there would be no impact.
- c. As discussed in Chapter 2, the Proposed Action would require the construction of a new access road to connect the DMC and California Aqueduct. The access road would be approximately 400 feet long and would be paved for all-weather access. Guardrails, drainage culverts, and erosion control measures would be installed to control surface runoff. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.
- d. Tracy Pumping Plant is currently authorized to pump up to 4,600 cfs, subject to all applicable water quality and fishery related pumping restrictions. No new entitlements would be needed.
- e. The Proposed Action would not have an effect on the capacity of any wastewater treatment provider.
- f. As stated in Chapter 2, excavated material from the construction of the Proposed Action would be limited and disposed of in spoilbanks in the federal and state ROWs. No material would be hauled or disposed of off site. Consequently, there would be no effect on any landfills.
- h. Although no solid waste is anticipated to be generated as a result of the Proposed Action, if any solid waste is produced, all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations will be complied with.

### No Action

The No Action Alternative would consist of a continuation of the existing conditions. No impact on utilities would occur as a result.

### Cumulative Impacts

The Proposed Action would need no utilities or service systems except for a minimal amount of electrical power (see Section 3.10, "Power"). It would therefore not contribute to a cumulative impact.



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>				
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a. The Proposed Action could have effects on biological resources, air quality, geology, hazards, and noise; however, with the adoption of environmental commitments as described in Chapter 2, these potential effects are considered less than significant. The particular impacts, as well as the Proposed Action design elements and environmental commitments that would reduce them below a level of significance, are described in respective sections.
- b. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064 provides that when assessing whether a cumulative effect requires preparation of an environmental impact report, the lead agency must consider both whether the cumulative impact is significant and whether the incremental effects of the Proposed Action are cumulatively considerable. No environmental impact report is required if the Proposed Action’s effects are not cumulatively considerable. The lead agency may determine that a Proposed Action’s contribution is less than cumulatively considerable when:
- the contribution would be rendered less than considerable through mitigation measures,
  - the Proposed Action would comply with the requirements of a previously approved mitigation program or plan that provides specific requirements that would avoid or substantially lessen the Proposed Action ‘s effects, or

- the Proposed Action's incremental impacts are so small that the environmental conditions would be essentially the same whether or not the Proposed Action was implemented (e.g., *de minimis*).

This EA/IS discusses cumulative impacts for each resource area. Please refer to these sections for additional detail. Consequently, it is determined that no cumulative impacts would occur as a result of the Proposed Action.

- i. The Proposed Action would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. The Proposed Action would have no effect on housing, land use, or recreation. Effects on air quality and noise have been determined to be less than significant with implementation of environmental commitments. Potential adverse effects, such as hazardous materials release, have been determined to be less than significant because of specified elements of the Proposed Action's design and the environmental commitments identified in this EA/IS.

## References Cited

### Printed References

Sherer, Steven. 2003. *Delta-Mendota Canal California Aqueduct Intertie Project geologic design data report*. Prepared for the U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation. August. Sacramento, CA.

### Personal Communications

Bruce Jensen, Alameda County Planning Department, 11/5/03.